

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/124,468 07/28/98 DUPERROUZEL

B 520044.401

000500 TM02/0806
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLL
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

HAILU, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173
DATE MAILED:

08/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/124,468	Applicant(s) Duperrouzel et al.
Examiner Tadesse Hailu	Art Unit 2173



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 21, 2001

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 835 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-30 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) 13 and 31-35 is/are objected to.
8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
a) All b) Some* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 20) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2173

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to a *RESPONSE* entered on 5/21/2001.

Specification & Drawings

2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (see page 19, lines 8 and 11). Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-12, 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042).**

Regarding claim 1, Adams et al (6,237,030) discloses a method for viewing a plurality of network locations concurrently, and in particular to a method and system for retrieving and

Art Unit: 2173

displaying a plurality of network locations in response to a single user input (col 1, lines 10-19, col 8, lines 64-col 9, lines 60). In addition, '030 discloses a display (160) having display controls (see figs. 6 or 8). Specially fig. 8 shows non-overlapping display areas, but it is not explicitly described whether these areas overlapped or not when adjusted, and these "display areas having a collective size equal to the sum of the non-overlapping display areas" could not be true if these areas overlapped. However, **Santos-Gomez (5,920,315)** discloses this shortcomings (see Abstract). Moreover while Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) further discloses a resizeable pane, "a sizing control operable by a user to adjust the size of the display areas simultaneously" is not explicitly shown.

However, Santos-Gomez improved his own invention by introducing a *Single Size Control Separator* (55) ("a sizing control") (col 7, lines 9-56) into his other patent (**5,771,042**) (see figs. 5 and 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the manipulating mechanism, such as resizing panes of Santos-Gomez with the display areas of Adams because user of the system would be able to adjust the display areas (panes) without overlapping one area over the other and view many documents simultaneously.

Regarding claims 2, 21, 22, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) describe either an independent browser application programs started for each displayed link or a single browser application ("one control action")

Art Unit: 2173

could be utilized to display the predetermined group of web pages (see Adams: col 11, lines 52-64).

Regarding claims 3, and 4, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose a network controller interface device to access other systems (see Adams: fig. 2 #36).

Regarding claims 5, 26, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose plurality of controls, such as menu options and toolbar buttons configured to manipulate a plurality of display areas, and user can select a web page from a saved bookmark list (see Adams: col 11, lines 6-37).

Regarding claim 6, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose a plurality of menu items when one of these items is selected it creates a pulldown menu area which is not part of the group (plurality of web sites) display area (see Adams: such as fig. 5, #105, col 11, lines 6-25).

Regarding claims 7, 27, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose that each display area for each web page is displayed in a predetermined order of web page selected from the bookmark list (see Adams: col 11, lines 38-col 12, lines 18).

Regarding claims 8, 28, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose that for each activated linked web page, there is a sequence and a predetermined order of display (see Adams: col 11, lines 38-51).

Art Unit: 2173

Regarding claim 9, while claim 9 not necessary identical in scope, contain limitations similar to independent claim 1, thus, claim 9 is also unpatentable for at least the reasons disclosed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, claim 10 is also unpatentable for at least the reasons disclosed above with respect to claim 2.

Regarding claim 11, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose a *Single Size Control Separator* (55) ("a sizing control") manipulated by a mouse (see '042: fig. 6).

Regarding claim 12, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose (see '042: figs. 5 and 6), wherein the size of the total display area of all workspace remains the same and it is also adds up to be equal to the total display area.

Regarding claim 13, objected, because no the display includes a *designator control* found.

Regarding claims 14, 29, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose a list of display controls such as *refresh, stop, home, and search* of Netscape Navigator features (see Adams: fig. 8).

Regarding claim 15, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose a list of controls such as *refresh, stop, home, back, forward, search* and web page selection that are display control features of Netscape Navigator (see '030:

Art Unit: 2173

fig. 8). Furthermore, each workspaces having its own display controls (having window properties) also described in '315 (see '315: col 5, lines 1-col 6, lines 40).

Regarding claim 16, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose that web pages that include Internet web pages (see '030: fig. 8).

Regarding claims 17, 18, 20, 23, Adams et al (6,237,030) in view of Santos-Gomez (5,920,315) and Santos-Gomez (5,771,042) disclose that a Location URL can be dragged and dropped on a desired display location to display a web page (see '030: col 6, lines 6-31).

Regarding claims 19, 24, 25, 30, while these claims not necessary identical in scope, contain limitations similar to independent claim 1, thus, these claims 19, 24, 25 and 30 are also unpatentable for at least the reasons disclosed above with respect to claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 13, 31-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The examiner has carefully considered all the claims 1-35. The present invention relates to display systems for displaying network-based web page display systems. The prior art of record fails to teach the combination of claim elements including "the controls of the display includes a

Art Unit: 2173

designator control operable by a user to designate the number of the plurality of non-overlapping display areas" of claim 13. The prior art of record also fails to teach the combination of claim elements including "a selection control configured to select a first set of web pages to be displayed in the display areas from the list of stored web pages sites in the data storage area, the number of web pages of the first set being less than or equal to the number of display areas in the plurality of display areas, ..." of claim 31. The prior art of record further fails to teach the combination of claim elements including "a scroll control configured to control an advancement of display of web pages from a list of web pages, ... sequentially shifting at least one page from the selected display area to a different selected display area." of claim 34.

Thus, prior art neither renders obvious nor anticipates the combination of claimed elements in light of the specification.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Tadesse Hailu*, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2799. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 - 5:30 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by

Art Unit: 2173

telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, *John Cabeca*, can be reached at (703) 308-3116 Art Unit 2173 CPK 2-4A51

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tadesse Hailu 30 July 2001



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173